



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/483,745	01/17/2000	Loredana Abramo	Abramo-1	8778	
48116	7590 05/01/2006		EXAMINER		
	FAY SHARPE/LUCENT			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
	1100 SUPERIOR AVE SEVENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAN	CLEVELAND, OH 44114		2178	•	
			DATE MAILED: 05/01/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/483,745	ABRAMO, LOREDANA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cong-Lac Huynh	2178				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 Fe	ebruary 2006.					
•	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15-22</u> is/are pending in the a	application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12 and 15-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	ived in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	, , ,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rece	ived.				
M						
Attachment(s)	4) Interview Summa	20. (PTO 413)				
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	al Patent Application (PTQ-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This action is responsive to communications: response filed 2/3/06 to the application filed on 1/17/00.
- 2. Claims 1-12, 15-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 19 are independent claims.
- 3. The rejections of claims 1-12, 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mcduff in view of Probert have been withdrawn in view of Applicants arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 7-8, 10, 12, 15, 18-20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDuff et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2001/0012356, 8/9/01, filed 9/30/97) in view of Probert, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,549,918 B1, 4/15/03, filed 9/21/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database ([0007], [0033]: receiving raw data from switching mechanism included in the telecommunication system and generating events about calling activity based on the raw data

Art Unit: 2178

implies that the telecommunication system includes the digital switching system with a switch database for storing the received raw switch data to be processed)

- storing the call information which is the raw cellular information in a table ([0083]- [0086])

Mcduff does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to convert data from one format to another, including providing data in spreadsheet format where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into Mcduff since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into Mcduff for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Mcduff into the spreadsheet format for easily performing calculations relating to business data.

Mcduff and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Mcduff and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to Mcduff and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Independent claim 7 is for an apparatus of method claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Mcduff and Probert do not explicitly disclose the operation of said data receiver, data converter and data output device are adapted to be triggered via a user's "Make Workbook" command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Probert to include the user's Make Workbook command since it was well known that spreadsheet has the command such as AutoFormat for formatting a workbook, which is a form of the Make Workbook command.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data ([0067], [0071]).

Claim 12 is for an apparatus of method claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, Mcduff discloses:

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switch ([007], [0033], [0039])
- storing the raw switch data, which is the call information, in a table ([0082]- [0086])

Mcduff does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one
 predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to convert data from one format to another, including providing data in spreadsheet format where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into Mcduff since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into Mcduff for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Mcduff into the spreadsheet format. Mcduff and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Mcduff and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to Mcduff and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 15, Mcduff further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data ([0067], [0071]).

Claims 19 and 22 are for an apparatus of method claims 15 and 18, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 20 includes the same limitation of apparatus claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 2-3, 9, 11, 17, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mcduff in view of Probert as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boyle et al. (US Pat No. 5,661,789, 8/26/97).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

 prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (0033], [0039]: the fact that the call center includes switching mechanism for switching the call data implies that a digital switch is installed in the system for performing the switching function)

Mcduff and Probert do not disclose:

performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a New
 Product Introduction test

Boyle discloses a new product testing is performed at a digital switch where raw data is received (col 1, line 60 to col 2, line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing new product testing at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital switch for various service purposes.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff discloses:

 prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch ([0033], [0039]: the fact that the call center includes switching mechanism for switching the call data implies that a digital switch is installed in the system for performing the switching function)

Mcduff does not disclose:

performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer
 Acceptance test

Boyle discloses:

- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer Acceptance test (col 1, lines 55-60, col 2, lines 40-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing customer acceptance test at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital switch for various service purposes.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Mcduff does not disclose that the switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new product installation data.

Art Unit: 2178

Boyle discloses a new product testing is performed at a digital switch where raw data is received (col 1, line 60 to col 2, line 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Boyle into Mcduff and Probert since performing new product testing at the digital switch in Boyle would provide the advantage to include in Mcduff and Probert for using various data including product testing data at the digital switch for various service purposes.

Claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, include the same limitations as in claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 17 includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 21 is for an apparatus of method claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 4-6, 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Freese et al. (US Pat No. 5,291,543).

Beamish et al. (US Pat No. 6,865,216).

Chafe (US Pat App Pub No.2001/0054097).

Sheffield (US Pat No 5,832,481).

Lyons (US Pat No 5,623,656).

Gupta et al. (US Pat No. 6,226,516).

Kredo (US Pat No 6,714,637).

Desmond et al. (US pat No 6,269,337).

Vaitzblit (US Pat App Pub No 2002/0007363).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cong-Lac Huynh Primary Examiner Art Unit 2178 04/20/06